

Bishellable drawings of K_n

Bernardo M. Ábrego* Oswin Aichholzer† Silvia Fernández-Merchant‡
 Dan McQuillan§ Bojan Mohar¶ Petra Mutzel|| Pedro Ramos**
 R. Bruce Richter†† Birgit Vogtenhuber‡‡

January 19, 2016

Abstract

The Harary-Hill conjecture, still open after more than 50 years, asserts that the crossing number of the complete graph K_n is

$$H(n) = \frac{1}{4} \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{n-3}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

Ábrego et al. [3] introduced the notion of shellability of a drawing D of K_n . They proved that if D is s -shellable for some $s \geq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, then D has at least $H(n)$ crossings. This is the first combinatorial condition on a drawing that guarantees at least $H(n)$ crossings.

In this work, we generalize the concept of s -shellability to bishellability, where the former implies the latter in the sense that every s -shellable drawing is, for any $b \leq s - 2$, also b -bishellable. Our main result is that $(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 2)$ -bishellability also guarantees, with a simpler proof than for s -shellability, that a drawing has at least $H(n)$ crossings. We exhibit a drawing of K_{11} that has $H(11)$ crossings, is 3-bishellable, and is not s -shellable for any $s \geq 5$. This shows that we have properly extended the class of drawings for which the Harary-Hill Conjecture is proved.

1 Introduction

We consider drawings of the complete graph K_n in the plane in which vertices are drawn as points in the plane and edges as simple planar curves that contain no vertices other than their endpoints. As usual, we require that all intersections are proper crossings (no tangencies) and that two edges share only a finite number of points. The number $\text{cr}(D)$ of crossings in a drawing D is the sum of the number of intersection points of all unordered pairs of interiors of edges. The *crossing number* $\text{cr}(G)$ is the minimum $\text{cr}(D)$ over all drawings D of G . A drawing is *crossing optimal* (or *minimal*) if it realizes $\text{cr}(D) = \text{cr}(G)$.

A long-standing conjecture is that the crossing number $\text{cr}(K_n)$ of the complete graph K_n is equal to

$$H(n) := \frac{1}{4} \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \right\rfloor \left\lfloor \frac{n-3}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

A very fine history of this and related problems is given by Beineke and Wilson [7]. They attribute the conjecture to Anthony Hill. As it is first published by Harary and Hill in [9], we propose the notation $H(n)$ used above to denote the conjectured value of $\text{cr}(K_n)$ and attribute the conjecture to Harary-Hill.

According to [7], Hill proposed a construction with vertices on two concentric cycles and conjectured $H(n)$ to be the number of crossings for those drawings. Blažek and Koman [8] proved the following variation of Hill's construction. Half of the vertices are drawn evenly spaced (as a cycle) at the rim of

*Department of Mathematics, California State University, Northridge, bernardo.abrego@csun.edu

†Institute for Software Technology, Graz University of Technology, oaich@ist.tugraz.at

‡Department of Mathematics, California State University, Northridge, silvia.fernandez@csun.edu

§Department of Mathematics, Norwich University, dmcquill@norwich.edu

¶Department of Mathematics, Simon Fraser University, mohar@sfu.ca

||Department of Computer Science, Technische Universität Dortmund, petra.mutzel@tu-dortmund.de

**Departamento de Física y Matemáticas, Universidad de Alcalá, pedro.ramos@uah.es

††Department of Combinatorics and Optimization, University of Waterloo, brichter@math.uwaterloo.ca

‡‡Institute for Software Technology, Graz University of Technology, bvogt@ist.tugraz.at

the top lid of a cylinder (tin can) and the remaining vertices are drawn evenly spaced at the rim of the bottom lid. The edges are drawn either as straight-lines within the cylinder lids or (in the case they connect two vertices from different lids) as shortest geodesic lines on the cylinder. This model is identical to the model with two concentric circles and it gave rise to a name for a whole class of drawings, see below.

So far, the conjecture has been verified for $n \leq 12$ only. Pan and Richter [12] have shown that $\text{cr}(K_{11})$ is 100 using a computer proof; well-known counting arguments show $\text{cr}(K_{12}) = 150$. McQuillan and Richter [11] present a computer-free proof that $\text{cr}(K_9) = 36$.

Recently, an important line of research has been started by Ábrego et al. [1], who restricted the allowed drawing styles and proved that for these drawings the conjecture is true. In [1], they consider 2-page book drawings of K_n in which all vertices are supposed to lie on a line ℓ and each edge needs to be drawn on one of the two half-planes defined by ℓ . In [2], the authors extended their techniques to *monotone* drawings of K_n , in which all the vertices have different x -coordinates and the edges are x -monotone curves. In [3], Ábrego et al. generalize their result to cylindrical drawings and x -bounded drawings. A *cylindrical drawing* has two concentric circles on which all the vertices must be placed and all edges must not intersect these circles. An *x -bounded drawing* requires that all edges are contained within a strip bounded by the vertical lines defined by their endpoints. Every monotone drawing is x -bounded and every 2-page book drawing is a cylindrical drawing, so their result indeed generalizes previous results. Their result, which also prompted this work, was based on the first general combinatorial condition on a drawing D of K_n that guarantees that D has at least $H(n)$ crossings. For this, they introduced the notion of *shellability* of a drawing of K_n .

In a related work, Balko et al. [6] give a combinatorial characterization of several classes of x -monotone drawings of complete graphs and show that also the odd crossing number (a different variant of counting crossings) of x -monotone drawings as well as shellable drawings of K_n is at least $H(n)$.

The purpose of this work is to define a more general version of shellability that we call *bishellability*, and which is implied by shellability. The main benefit of our approach is the simplification of the principal concept. This allows a significantly simpler and more intuitive proof for the fact that bishellable drawings satisfy the Harary-Hill Conjecture. Moreover, bishellability reflects better the required properties. We are convinced that this is a further step to gain more insight into the structure of crossing minimal drawings, with the ultimate goal to prove the Harary-Hill Conjecture.

(For the following definition, we recall that, for a drawing D of K_n , a *face* of D is a component of $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus D[K_n]$. This is the same notion as for embeddings: if we convert each crossing point of D into a vertex, then the faces of D are the faces of the planarly embedded graph.) Finally, if V is a subset of vertices in the drawing, $D - V$ denotes the drawing obtained when vertices of V and all edges incident to them are deleted from D .

Definition 1 ([3]). *For a positive integer s , a planar drawing D of K_n is s -shellable if there is a sequence $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_s$ of distinct vertices of D so that, relative to a reference face F , for all integers r, t with $1 \leq r < t \leq s$, the vertices v_r and v_t are both incident with the face of $D - \{v_1, \dots, v_{r-1}, v_{t+1}, \dots, v_s\}$ containing F .*

Their main theorem in [3] is the following.

Theorem 2. *Let D be a drawing of K_n . If there is an integer $s \geq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ such that D is s -shellable, then $\text{cr}(D) \geq H(n)$.*

One of the disadvantages of the notion of shellability is that s -shellable does not imply $(s-1)$ -shellable. This is because the sequence $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_s$ of vertices needs to be circular to get from the reference face F and back to F again, and a long circular sequence does not imply a shorter circular sequence.

We introduce a more general variant of shellability that we call *bishellability*.

Definition 3. *For a non-negative integer s , a drawing D of K_n is s -bishellable if there exist sequences $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_s$ and $b_s, b_{s-1}, \dots, b_1, b_0$, each sequence consisting of distinct vertices of K_n , so that, with respect to a reference face F :*

- (1) *for each $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, s$, the vertex a_i is incident with the face of $D - \{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}\}$ that contains F ;*
- (2) *for each $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, s$, the vertex b_i is incident with the face of $D - \{b_0, b_1, \dots, b_{i-1}\}$ that contains F ; and*
- (3) *for each $i = 0, 1, \dots, s$, the set $\{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_i\} \cap \{b_{s-i}, b_{s-i-1}, \dots, b_0\} = \emptyset$.*

We remark that if $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_s$ and $b_s, b_{s-1}, \dots, b_0$ show that D is s -bishellable, then the same sequences without a_s and b_s show that D is $(s-1)$ -bishellable. Moreover, the vertices a_0 and b_0 must lie on the boundary of the common face F .

Also, if D is s -shellable, with witnessing sequence $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_s$, then D is $(s-2)$ -bishellable with witnessing sequences $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{s-2}$ and $b_{s-2}, b_{s-3}, \dots, b_0$ defined by $a_i = v_{i+1}$ and $b_i = v_{s-i}$.

Here is the version of Theorem 2 that holds for bishellable drawings; its proof is in the next section.

Theorem 4. *If D is an $(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 2)$ -bishellable drawing of K_n , then $\text{cr}(D) \geq H(n)$.*

There are two main remarks to be made here. First is the pleasant feature that the theorem requires only one value for the amount of bishellability of the drawing. Second, even though the same principal ideas are used in the two proofs, the proof of Theorem 4 involves a simpler induction than the proof of Theorem 2 in [3]. This is due to the monotonicity of the new definition of bishellability.

Besides the proof of Theorem 4, we show that bishellability leads to an extended class of drawings for which the Harary-Hill Conjecture is true. Figure 4 shows an example of a drawing D of K_{11} that is 3-bishellable (so Theorem 4 shows $\text{cr}(D) \geq H(11)$), but, for every $s \geq 5$, is not s -shellable (so Theorem 2 does not apply).

To simplify the discussion, we define a drawing D of K_n to be *shellable* if it is s -shellable for some $s \geq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, and *bishellable* if it is $(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 2)$ -bishellable. That is, shellable and bishellable drawings have at least $H(n)$ crossings. Furthermore, we call a drawing of K_n *Harary-Hill optimal* if it has $H(n)$ crossings. We use this notation to keep in mind that drawings with $H(n)$ crossings are only conjectured to be optimal.

2 Bishellable Drawings and the Crossing Number

In this section, we recall the notion of good drawings and k -edges, and how to express the crossing number of a drawing D in terms of a weighted sum of the numbers of k -edges, for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1$. Then we prove that, under the assumption that a drawing D is bishellable, for each relevant k , the relevant weighted sum of k -edges is large enough to prove that there are at least $H(n)$ crossings in D .

2.1 Preliminaries

We remark that we consider only *good* drawings (also known as simple topological drawings): no edge can cross itself; no two edges with a common incident vertex can cross; and no two edges can cross more than once. It is well-known that any drawing of a graph G with fewest crossings is necessarily good.

The relation between the number of crossings in a rectilinear (or pseudo-linear) drawing of K_n and the number of its k -edges was first described by Lovász et al. [10] and, independently, by Ábrego and Fernández [5]. Ábrego et al. [1] generalized the notion of k -edges to arbitrary good drawings, as follows. Fix a drawing D of K_n and a face F of D . For an edge uv of D , we arbitrarily choose one of its orientations: here we use u to v . For each other vertex w , the three vertices u, v, w induce a 3-cycle T in D . Because D is a good drawing, T is a simple closed curve in the sphere (it is slightly simpler technically to consider embeddings in the sphere rather than the plane).

As we traverse T from u to v to w and back to u , T has natural right and left sides relative to the directed edge uv . Assign to w the side R (right) if F is on the left side of T ; otherwise, assign L (left) to w . Thus, for each $w \notin \{u, v\}$, w is assigned either R or L . Then uv is a k -edge if k is the smaller of the number of R 's and L 's (for uv). Note that being a k -edge is independent of the orientation of the edge uv as reversing uv simply exchanges all the labels R and L .

We make one small observation that helps the later discussion: every edge e that has a segment incident with F is a 0-edge. To see this, suppose some segment $\tilde{e}$ of e is incident with F and we orient e so that F is to the left of $\tilde{e}$. Then, for every w not incident with e , the 3-cycle determined by e and w will have F on the left side, showing w is an R . That is, all vertices are R with respect to e , so e is a 0-edge, as claimed.

2.2 Proof of Theorem 4

One main ingredient of the proof is the relation between the number of k -edges and the number of crossings in a drawing. This relation was shown for rectilinear drawings in [5, 10] and extended to good drawings in [1], where it is shown that the number of crossings of a good drawing can be expressed as a

weighted sum of the number of k -edges of the drawing. We include this discussion in the appendix, for the sake of completeness.

Specifically, if we denote by $E_k(D)$ the number of k -edges of D and consider

$$E_{\leq k}(D) := \sum_{j=0}^k E_j(D)$$

and

$$E_{\leq \leq k}(D) := \sum_{j=0}^k E_{\leq j}(D) = \sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{i=0}^j E_i(D) = \sum_{i=0}^k (k+1-i) E_i(D)$$

in [1] it is shown that

$$\text{cr}(D) = 2 \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 2} E_{\leq \leq k}(D) - \frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{2} \left\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \right\rfloor - \frac{1}{2} (1 + (-1)^n) E_{\leq \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 2}(D). \quad (1)$$

Therefore, any lower bound on $E_{\leq \leq k}(D)$ translates immediately into a lower bound for $\text{cr}(D)$ and, specifically, showing that $E_{\leq \leq k}(D) \geq 3 \binom{k+3}{3}$ implies $\text{cr}(D) \geq H(n)$.

Lemma 5. *If a drawing D of K_n is k -bishellable and $0 \leq k \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 2$, then*

$$E_{\leq \leq k}(D) \geq 3 \binom{k+3}{3}.$$

Proof of Theorem 4. Since D is $(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 2)$ -bishellable, for each $k = 0, 1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 2$, the drawing D is k -bishellable. Therefore, Lemma 5 implies that

$$\text{for all } k \in \{0, 1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 2\}, \quad E_{\leq \leq k}(D) \geq 3 \binom{k+3}{3},$$

as required. Plugging these lower bounds into Equation 1 the desired lower bound of $H(n)$ on the number of crossings in D follows (for details see the proof of Theorem 3 in [1]). $\square$

Proof of Lemma 5. We essentially follow the ideas of the proofs in [3], but use a simpler and more direct approach provided by the new concept of bishellability. We proceed by induction on k . The base case of $k = 0$ is trivial, as the face F is incident with at least three edges and each of these is a 0-edge. Thus,

$$\sum_{i=0}^0 (0+1-i) E_0(D) = E_0(D) \geq 3 = 3 \binom{0+3}{3},$$

as required.

For the induction step, let $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k$ and $b_k, b_{k-1}, \dots, b_0$ be sequences witnessing k -bishellability. Consider the drawing $D - a_0$. Then $a_1, \dots, a_k, b_{k-1}, \dots, b_0$ show it is $(k-1)$ -bishellable and, since $k-1 \leq (\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 2) - 1 \leq \lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor - 2$, the induction implies that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} ((k-1)+1-i) E_i(D - a_0) \geq 3 \binom{(k-1)+3}{3}.$$

Rewritten, this is

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (k-i) E_i(D - a_0) \geq 3 \binom{k+2}{3}.$$

Consider an edge e in $D - a_0$. If e is an i -edge with $i \leq \lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor - 2$, then it is either an i -edge or an $(i+1)$ -edge of D , depending on whether a_0 joins the majority or minority part of the R 's and L 's with respect to e in $D - a_0$. We call those that are i -edges in both $D - a_0$ and D *invariant*.

Note that the coefficient of a non-invariant i -edge in the sum for $D - a_0$ is $k-i$, while its coefficient in the D -sum is $(k+1) - (i+1) = k-i$. Thus, its contribution to each sum is the same. On the other hand, an invariant i -edge contributes $k-i$ to the $(D - a_0)$ -sum and $k+1-i$ to the D -sum.

There is additional contribution to the D -sum from the edges incident with a_0 . We will discuss those shortly. But these remarks allow us to conclude that

$$\sum_{i=0}^k (k+1-i)E_i(D) \geq \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (k-i)E_i(D-a_0) + |\text{invariant edges}| + \text{contrib. of } a_0\text{-edges}.$$

We shall prove that there are at least $\binom{k+2}{2}$ invariant edges and the contribution of the edges incident with a_0 is at least $2\binom{k+2}{2}$. Together with the induction assumption applied to $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (k-i)E_i(D)$, we conclude that

$$E_{\leq k}(D) = \sum_{i=0}^k (k+1-i)E_i(D) \geq 3\binom{k+2}{3} + 3\binom{k+2}{2} = 3\binom{k+3}{3},$$

as required.

We start with the edges incident with a_0 . Let e_0 and e'_0 be the two edges incident with a_0 so that the corner of the reference face F at a_0 contains both e_0 and e'_0 . Consequently, the fact that $k \leq \binom{n}{2} - 2$ shows that we may write the cyclic rotation of the edges incident with a_0 as $(e_0, e_1, \dots, e_k, \dots, e'_k, e'_{k-1}, \dots, e'_1, e'_0)$.

To make the discussion uniform, orient all edges incident with a_0 away from a_0 . Consideration of any 3-cycle (a_0, u, v, a_0) shows that, if, relative to the edge a_0u , v is L , then, relative to a_0v , u is R .

We arbitrarily choose the orientation of the sphere so that all the vertices not incident with e_0 are R 's for e_0 . Because deleting $e_0, e_1, \dots, e_{i-1}$ puts e_i into the boundary of the (extended) reference face, we see that e_i has at most i L 's and all the rest are R 's. From this it is immediate that e_i is an $\leq i$ -edge, as required.

In particular, letting j be that integer such that e_i is a j -edge, we know e_i contributes $k+1-j$ to the sum $\sum_{i=0}^k (k+1-i)E_i(D)$. Since $j \leq i$, $k+1-j \geq k+1-i$, so e_i contributes at least $k+1-i$ to the sum. Therefore, $e_0, e_1, \dots, e_k$ contribute at least $(k+1) + k + \dots + 2 + 1 = \binom{k+2}{2}$ to the sum $\sum_{i=0}^k (k+1-i)E_i(D)$. Likewise, $e'_0, e'_1, \dots, e'_k$ contribute at least the same amount, as desired for the contribution from the edges incident with a_0 .

The invariant edges are determined by the b_i 's. The main point is that b_0 is incident with at least $k+1$ invariant edges upon deletion of a_0 . To see this, we observe that if f_0 and f'_0 are the edges incident with b_0 at the corner of F incident with b_0 then the symmetry $a_0 \leftrightarrow b_0$ in the definition of bishellable drawings implies that the cyclic rotation of edges at b_0 can be taken as $(f_0, f_1, \dots, f_k, \dots, f'_k, f'_{k-1}, \dots, f'_1, f'_0)$.

We may choose the labelling of the f_i and f'_i so that a_0b_0 is not one of $f_0, f_1, \dots, f_k$. We know that, for $0 \leq i \leq k$, f_i has only the non- b_0 ends of $f_0, f_1, \dots, f_{i-1}$ as possible L 's (say), with the remaining vertices being R 's. In particular, a_0 is an R for all of $f_0, f_1, \dots, f_k$. It follows that, for some $j \leq i$, f_i is a j -edge in both D and $D - a_0$. That is, b_0 is incident with at least $k+1$ invariant edges.

Here is the other significant simplification due to bishellability. The identical argument applies to the vertex b_i in the $(k-i)$ -bishellable drawing $D_i = D - \{b_0, b_1, \dots, b_{i-1}\}$, as witnessed by the sequences $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{k-i}$ and $b_k, b_{k-1}, \dots, b_i$. The vertex b_i (in the role corresponding to b_0 in the preceding paragraph) is incident with at least $(k-i+1)$ edges invariant (relative to D_i and $D_i - a_0$). The values (R or L) of $b_{i-1}, b_{i-2}, \dots, b_0$ are, for each of the edges incident with b_i , independent of whether we consider D_i or $D_i - a_0$. Thus, each edge of D_i incident with b_i is a j -edge of D if and only if it is a j -edge in $D - a_0$. It follows that D has, in total, at least $(k+1) + k + \dots + 1 = \binom{k+2}{2}$ invariant edges incident with $b_k, b_{k-1}, \dots, b_0$, as required. $\square$

3 Bishellable and Non-bishellable Drawings

In this section we show that the concept of bishellability is really more general than the concept of shellability, in the sense that there exist bishellable drawings that are not shellable. We start by considering conditions for drawings to be shellable or bishellable, respectively. Obviously a simple cycle in a drawing D made up with at least $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ non-crossed edges guarantees that D is shellable and thus also bishellable. Also, a path of $2\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 3$ non-crossed edges with distinct vertices $a_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 2}, a_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 3}, \dots, a_1, a_0, b_0, b_1, \dots, b_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 3}, b_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 2}$ implies that D bishellable. Of course these are sufficient but not necessary conditions. Figure 1 shows on the left a bishellable drawing of K_6 where a_0 and b_0 are incident to the same cell F , but the edge a_0b_0 is crossed. However, this drawing is not Harary-Hill optimal, as in a Harary-Hill optimal drawing for two vertices which are incident to the same cell the connecting edge can always be drawn within this cell without crossings.




Figure 1: Two drawings of K_6 : Left: bishellable drawing with a crossed edge a_0b_0 ; right: non-bishellable drawing.

In [3] it has already been argued that all cylindrical, x -bounded, monotone, and 2-page book drawings of K_n are shellable and therefore have at least $H(n)$ crossings. Two generic classes of Harary-Hill optimal drawings have been known, i.e., for any n there exist cylindrical and 2-page book drawings with precisely $H(n)$ crossings.




Figure 2: Non-bishellable, Harary-Hill optimal drawing of K_{11} where all edges are crossed [4].

Only recently new families of Harary-Hill optimal drawings have been discovered. In [4] two new families have been constructed for odd $n \geq 11$. Both are based on the known Harary-Hill optimal cylindrical drawings. For one family there is just an additional vertex added in the center of the inner cycle, plus incident edges. The edges of the outer cycle remain uncrossed, and thus these drawings are also shellable and bishellable.

The second family is more interesting, as in addition several edges are redrawn in a way so that, for $n \geq 11$, every edge is crossed by at least one other edge. It is to some extent counterintuitive that such drawings can be Harary-Hill optimal; see [4] for more details and Figure 2 for such a drawing of K_{11} . Note that in these drawings not only are there no non-crossed edges, but also no two vertices share a common cell. Thus, these drawings can neither be shellable nor bishellable. So far, this constitutes the only known family of drawings of K_n which is Harary-Hill optimal but not bishellable.

The smallest complete graph where a non-bishellable drawing exists is K_6 , depicted in Figure 1, right.




Figure 3: Harary-Hill optimal drawing of K_9 that is not bishellable.

However, this example is not Harary-Hill optimal. The smallest Harary-Hill optimal drawing which is not bishellable is the one of K_9 shown in Figure 3. It is worthwhile to mention that out of the 421 Harary-Hill optimal drawings of K_9 this is the only non-bishellable drawing, up to weak isomorphism (two drawings of K_n are weakly isomorphic if they have the same (or reversed) rotation system).




Figure 4: Harary-Hill optimal drawing of K_{11} that is not s -shellable for any $s \geq 5$, but bishellable.

The smallest example of a Harary-Hill optimal drawing that is not shellable but bishellable is the drawing of K_{11} shown in Figure 4. The two sequences a_0, a_1, a_2, a_3 and b_3, b_2, b_1, b_0 proving bishellability are indicated in the drawing. The example is symmetric and almost a 2-page book drawing, or a monotone drawing. There are just two edges of the spine that are crossed and two edges that are non-monotone.

4 Conclusion

Recent progress on the rectilinear crossing number of K_n has depended on making more refined estimates than that provided by Lemma 5. These refinements cannot occur in the context of the (topological) crossing number considered in this paper, as the bound in Lemma 5 cannot be improved for a drawing having $H(n)$ crossings.

Also, it is now known that almost half of the more than 400,000 (up to weakly isomorphism) Harary-Hill optimal drawings of K_{11} are not shellable, and this almost surely applies in roughly equal numbers to bishellable. It seems likely that, as n grows, the proportion of bishellable Harary-Hill optimal drawings vanishes. However, Theorem 4 (indeed Theorem 2 is enough) implies, for example, that any drawing with $K_{\frac{n}{2}}$ drawn in the southern hemisphere (using an uncrossed $\frac{n}{2}$ -cycle on the equator) and the remaining $K_{\frac{n}{2}}$ drawn in the northern hemisphere (arbitrarily) must have at least $H(n)$ crossings. These kinds of drawings play a role in the computer-free proof [11] that $\text{cr}(K_9) = 36$.

We close with some open problems:

- Can we construct a family of Harary-Hill optimal drawings of K_n which are non-shellable, but bishellable, similar to the constructions in [4]? The drawing of K_{11} shown in Figure 4 might be a good start.
- Is there a concept similar to bishellability that does not require the starting vertices of the sequences to share a cell, but still implies at least $H(n)$ crossings? This would mean that each of the two sequences could have their own (local) reference faces.

Acknowledgements Research for this article was initiated during the *AIM Workshop on Exact Crossing Numbers* held from April 28 to May 2, 2014 in Palo Alto (California, USA). We are grateful to the American Institute of Mathematics (AIM) for their support and we thank the participants of that workshop for fruitful and inspiring discussions.

Furthermore, O.A. and B.V. were partially supported by the ESF EUROCORES programme EuroGIGA – CRP ComPoSe, Austrian Science Fund (FWF): I648-N18; S.F.-M. was supported by the NSF grant DMS-1400653; P.M. was partially supported by the ESF EUROCORES programme EuroGIGA – CRP GraDR, 10-EuroGIGA-OP-003 (DFG); P.R. was partially supported by the ESF EUROCORES programme EuroGIGA – CRP ComPoSe, MICINN Project EUI-EURC-2011-4306; and B.M. and R.B.R. were supported by NSERC.

References

- [1] Bernardo M. Ábrego, Oswin Aichholzer, Silvia Fernández-Merchant, Pedro Ramos, and Gelasio Salazar. The 2-page crossing number of K_n . *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 49(4):747–777, 2013.
- [2] Bernardo M. Ábrego, Oswin Aichholzer, Silvia Fernández-Merchant, Pedro Ramos, and Gelasio Salazar. More on the crossing number of K_n : Monotone drawings. *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics*, 44:411–414, 2013.
- [3] Bernardo M. Ábrego, Oswin Aichholzer, Silvia Fernández-Merchant, Pedro Ramos, and Gelasio Salazar. Shellable drawings and the cylindrical crossing number of K_n . *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 52(4):743–753, 2014.
- [4] Bernardo M. Ábrego, Oswin Aichholzer, Silvia Fernández-Merchant, Pedro Ramos, and Birgit Vogtenhuber. Non-shellable drawings of K_n with few crossings. In *CCCG 2014, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada*, 2014.
- [5] Bernardo M. Ábrego and Silvia Fernández-Merchant. A lower bound for the rectilinear crossing number. *Graphs and Combinatorics*, 21(3):293–300, 2005.
- [6] Martin Balko, Radoslav Fulek, and Jan Kynčl. Crossing numbers and combinatorial characterization of monotone drawings of K_n . *Discrete and Computational Geometry*, pages 1–37, 2014.
- [7] Lowell Beineke and Robin Wilson. The early history of the brick factory problem. *Math. Intelligencer*, 32(2):41–48, 2010.

- [8] J. Blažek and M. Koman. A minimal problem concerning complete plane graphs. In *Theory of Graphs and its Applications, Proceedings of the Symposium held in Smolenice in June 1963*, volume 8, pages 113–117, 1964.
- [9] Frank Harary and Anthony Hill. On the number of crossings in a complete graph. In *Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc.*, volume 13, pages 333–338, 1963.
- [10] L. Lovász, K. Vesztegombi, U. Wagner, and E. Welzl. Convex quadrilaterals and k-sets. towards a theory of geometric graphs. In J. Pach, editor, *AMS Contemp. Math. Series*, volume 342, pages 139–148, 2004.
- [11] Dan McQuillan and R. Bruce Richter. On the crossing number of K_n without computer assistance. submitted.
- [12] Shengjun Pan and R. Bruce Richter. The crossing number of K_{11} is 100. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 56(2):128–134, 2007.

Appendix: Crossings and k -edges

If we consider good drawings of K_4 , it is well-known that there are only two such drawings up to spherical homeomorphisms. However, the one with a crossing has, again up to spherical homeomorphisms, two different faces: one is incident with a 4-cycle and the other is incident with two vertices and the crossing. It is easy to verify that:

1. if F is bounded by the 4-cycle, then the four edges of the 4-cycle are all 0-edges while the crossing edges are both 1-edges;
2. if F is incident with just two vertices and the crossing, then the two crossing edges are 0-edges, the full edge incident with F is a 0-edge, as is its opposite edge in the uncrossed 4-cycle, and the other two edges in the uncrossed 4-cycle are 1-edges; and
3. in the case of the planar drawing of K_4 , the three edges incident with F are the 0-edges, and the other three edges are the 1-edges.

The preceding paragraph can be used to relate crossings in a drawing D of K_n and k -edges. Each crossing determines a K_4 containing precisely two 1-edges (relative to the face containing the reference face F of D). Each non-crossing K_4 contains three 1-edges.

It follows that if we count the number of ordered pairs (e, K_4) so that e is a 1-edge of this K_4 , the total number we get is $3P + 2N$, where P is the number of planar K_4 's and N is the number of non-planar K_4 's. On the other hand, if uv is a k -edge, and w, w' are distinct vertices both different from both u and v , then the K_4 induced by u, v, w, w' has uv as a 1-edge if and only if one of w and w' is an R (relative to uv) and the other is an L . It follows that every k -edge uv is a 1-edge in $k(n - 2 - k)$ different K_4 's. That is, the number of pairs (e, K_4) where e is a 1-edge of the K_4 is $\sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1} k(n - 2 - k)E_k(D)$, where, for $k \leq \lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1$, $E_k(D)$ denotes the number of k -edges in D .

The conclusion (exactly as in [1, 5, 10]) is that

$$3P + 2N = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1} k(n - 2 - k)E_k(D). \quad (2)$$

On the other hand, $P + N$ is the total number of K_4 's in K_n , so

$$P + N = \binom{n}{4}. \quad (3)$$

Multiply Equation (3) by 3, subtract Equation (2), and use the obvious fact that $N = \text{cr}(D)$ to conclude that

$$\text{cr}(D) = 3\binom{n}{4} - \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1} k(n - 2 - k)E_k(D). \quad (4)$$

Equivalent to the proof of Proposition 1 in [1] this equation can be rewritten to

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cr}(D) &= 2 \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 2} \sum_{i=0}^k (k + 1 - i) E_i(D) - \frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{2} \lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} (1 + (-1)^n) \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 2} (\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 2 + 1 - i) E_i(D). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

If we consider

$$E_{\leq k}(D) := \sum_{j=0}^k E_j(D)$$

and

$$E_{\leq \leq k}(D) := \sum_{j=0}^k E_{\leq j}(D) = \sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{i=0}^j E_i(D) = \sum_{i=0}^k (k + 1 - i) E_i(D)$$

we can get the original formulation in [1]:

$$\text{cr}(D) = 2 \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 2} E_{\leq \leq k}(D) - \frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{2} \left\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \right\rfloor - \frac{1}{2} (1 + (-1)^n) E_{\leq \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 2}(D). \quad (6)$$